Paragraph 3 of the DA rejects claims 1, 2, 11, 17, 22 and 23. I will address each of those below.

Claim 1 is amended to now read:

"1. (Currently Amended) A method of configuring a communications system utilizing CALL PULL-BACK technology as disclosed in the issued U.S. patent, Serial No. 6,088,437, dated July 11, 2000. The Objects are first disclosed in the ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE page 33, line 16, of the above referenced issued U.S. patent CALL PROCESSING, METHOD AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT as preprogrammed and proven software constructs. Over time, hardware changes require the rewriting of the Objects in new languages. The functionality of the OBJECTS is defined in the **Object/Class of Service documentation, starting on page 15 of this application**, incorporated herein by reference as though set forth in full. Once the functionality of each Object is known, it is a simple matter to rewrite each Object as needed. This method is comprised of the following steps:

Preparing Objects as preprogrammed software constructs, said Objects being configured to perform predetermined functions when populated with a set of user definable parameters subsequently executed by processors;

Inputting said set of user definable parameters into said Objects so as to perform said predetermined functions when executed by said processors."

Claim 2 is amended to now read:

"2. (Currently Amended) A reconfigurable communications system, comprising processors data and voice input devices; memory encoded with Objects as preprogrammed software constructs, said Objects being configured to perform predetermined functions when populated with a set of user definable parameters input by said input devices and subsequently executed by the processors."

Claim 11 is withdrawn.

There were no claims numbered 22 and 23 in the original application. Consequently, there are no comments regarding those claims in this amendment.

I understand the quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as set forth in paragraph 4 of the DA. I will address the issues presented by that section below.

I have carefully read Barnhouse et al., USPN 6,393,467, with regard to Claims 1 and 2, and I fail to see any conflict with this patent application. The CALL PULL-BACK technology I disclosed in the issued U.S. patent, Serial No. 6,088,437, dated July 11, 2000, describes a method of placing a tone receiver on a line and being able to accurately

identify the frequencies and cadences associated with ringing, busy, fast busy, answered and no answer conditions. This is accomplished by utilizing a bucket concept the result being that there is no need to tune the equipment to each central office.

The term Object is a term commonly used to describe a preprogrammed and proven software construct. The issue is not the use of the word "Object," but is instead one of functionality. I created command line Objects that allow non-technical personnel who understand the business needs of a client to rapidly and reliably create, manipulate or destroy a client's application. This enables one to cost effectively create a custom application for every client, thereby giving a huge advantage to the application creator over a competitor. After carefully reading DEC CIT, it is my belief that it does not conflict with this patent application either. My Objects also act as a common operating control in that they issue commands to other servers invoking related applications.

With regard to your paragraphs entitled "As per claim 3" and "As per claim 4," I'm not sure I understand what you mean. You appear to be talking about the documentation I have disclosed that demonstrates the functions of each Object. **Object/Class of Service documentation, starting on page 15 of this application.** If so, then this is simply a disclosure and not a claim. If you are talking about the information disclosed on page 21, this produces a drawing of a given client's application, thereby enabling someone responsible for supporting that application to rapidly gain an understanding of the clients configuration.

Your paragraph entitled "As per claim 5" actually refers to claim 14 in the original application, which is now the (Currently Amended) claim 10. If you feel the packaging of an application as a consumer product that allows a user to build and activate a Virtual Environment is in conflict with either Barnhouse or the CIT-DEC development I will withdraw the claim As per claim 6. This doesn't seem to relate to claim 6 or the original claim 15 (Currently Amended) to claim 11. If the above claim 5 is denied or withdrawn then anything related to the packaging of an application as a consumer product should be withdrawn as well.

Your paragraphs entitled "As per claim 7 and 8" and "As per claim 9" do not appear to be related to any prior claims other then the above "As per claim 5." If the claim you describe in your paragraph entitled "As per claim 5" is denied or withdrawn, then anything related to the packaging of an application as a consumer product should be withdrawn as well.

With regard to your paragraph entitled, "As per claim 10," I re-read Barnhouse et al. col. 10, lines 21-67, col. 13, line 14, to col. 14, line 25 and col. 6 lines 35-42. The Objects covered by this patent application do not use API's or GUIs. Unlike Barnhouse, et al, this network utilizes one switch for each NOCC and they are all made by the same manufacturer. They are all the same model and they are all operating at the same software level. Consequently, there is no need to develop any service multiple times. The softswitches and applications reside in the core of the network and deploy services out to the edge of the network. In addition, there is no need for facility processing. I don't understand your statement, "But Barnhouse does not specify the configuration

system is configuring objects to perform functions that are customizable by user defined parameters." There is no configuration system. There are only the preprogrammed Objects and the users. Application designers simply place the users' mailboxes into the appropriate Objects, enter user variables and voice the applications.

With regard to "As per claim 11," please see claim 2.

Your paragraph entitled "As per claim 12" relates to (Currently Amended) claim 8, and as that claim is amended, I believe your comment no longer applies. Normally, the person responsible for maintaining the records of a given client's application would note the relationships of the Objects used, the variables they are populated with and create a drawing representing that given client's configuration. What I have done is to create a master drawing stored on a computer that allows the person documenting a given client's configuration to delete from a copy of the master drawing by highlighting the unneeded parts of the drawing and pressing the delete key. That leaves inputting the variables and the client's contact information.

With regard to your paragraph entitled, "As per claim 13," I believe your comment refers to (Currently Amended) claim 7. The Objects I have created are used to build applications we Call Virtual Companies or Virtual Environments. As far as I can see, this is totally different from what Barnhouse et al. is doing. Some of the terms we use are the same, such as "multi-media messaging," but the context is totally different. My Objects create custom applications that provide VoIP call processing, messaging, video and voice conferencing plug in applications etc. These applications perform primary and secondary answering and are often used for disaster protection. The applications network a given client's personnel together, allow one to leave the office and log on from a remote location, thereby causing a redirecting of traffic to their current location.

With regard to your paragraph entitled, "As per claim 16," I am not implementing a call processing system. I am using Objects I have written to implement Virtual Environment applications on a call processor. These Objects do not perform service testing that is handled by the person implementing the application. While each type of configuration is equivalent to a subset of predetermined functions, an individual responsible for designing and building a given client's application does the configuring instead of the use of a third code. In reviewing the fourth code, I don't use a code configured to configure the selected preprogrammed software objects based on the user calling instances and events. User events such as touch-tone input are variables and depending on their value trigger the desired event.

With regard to "As per claim 17," this amended patent application should address your concerns.

With regard to "As per claim 18," please note that none of the claims in the old or new version of this patent application mentions a database.

With regard to "As per claim 19," please refer to claim 10 of this letter.

With regard to "As per claim 20," an example of this method is disclosed in the body of this amended patent application, pages 27 through 30.

With regard to your paragraph entitled, "As per claim 21," the original claim 21 stated "A method of documenting each Object used by the personnel responsible for the creation, manipulation and destruction of Virtual Voice/Company/Office Networks." I cannot see how this relates to what is stated in your paragraph entitled, "As per claim 21" in the DA.

With regard to your paragraph entitled, "As per claim 14," I agree all mention of a Sonet ring ATM or a meshed network have been removed.

Please note that the original patent application only had 21 claims and not the 31 set forth in the DA. It would be inappropriate to reject the application on the basis that claims 22-31 were rejected, when, in fact, they were never presented in the first place.

If you need additional information, please feel free to contact me.

Very truly yours,

John Kenneth Amick

JKA:mk
Encs.